CA	ATEGORICAL	EXCLUSION / E	Environmental Document NVIRONMENTAL A ROJECT INFORMATION	ASSESSMENT FORM
Road	I No./County:	SR 26, Clinton County		
Desig	gnation Number:	1400263		,
Term		County, Indiana.	4	0.38 mile east of SR 75 in Clinto
	completing this form, I lapprove if Level 4 CE		lifies for the following type of Ca	tegorical Exclusion (FHWA must
			posed action meets the criteria uired Signatories: ESM (Envir	for Categorical Exclusion Manu conmental Scoping Manager)
X	Categorical Excl Level 3 - table 1,	usion, Level 3 — The prop CE Level Thresholds. Requ	oosed action meets the criteria uired Signatories: ESM, ES (E	for Categorical Exclusion Manu Environmental Services Division)
			osed action meets the criteria uired Signatories: ESM, ES, F.	for Categorical Exclusion Manus
	According to the control of the cont			
	Environmental A is necessary to det	ermine the effects on the e	nvironment. Required Signato	
Appro	Environmental A is necessary to det for documents prepared by to release for public involved. ESM Signatur	ermine the effects on the error for Environmental Services Department or sign for approval. Date FHWA Signature	nvironment. Required Signato	
Appro	Environmental A is necessary to det for documents prepared by to release for public involved ESM Signatures for Public Involved	ermine the effects on the error for Environmental Services Department or sign for approval. Date FHWA Signature	nvironment. Required Signato Sivision, it is not necessary for the ESI ES Signature	ries: ES, FHWA M of the district in which the project is
Appro	Environmental A is necessary to det for documents prepared by to release for public involved and ESM Signatures for Public Involved CA	ermine the effects on the error for Environmental Services Department or sign for approval. Date FHWA Signature	nvironment. Required Signato Sivision, it is not necessary for the ESI ES Signature	ries: ES, FHWA M of the district in which the project is
Appro Releas ESM In	Environmental A is necessary to det is necessary to det for documents prepared by to release for public involved ESM Signature for Public Involved NIA	ermine the effects on the error for Environmental Services Department or sign for approval. Date Date	nvironment. Required Signato Division, it is not necessary for the ESI ES Signature Date	Date 4-30-19
Appro Releas ESM In	Environmental A is necessary to det or documents prepared by to release for public involved ESM Signatur ESM Signatur See for Public Involved MA initials	ermine the effects on the error for Environmental Services Department or sign for approval. Date Date Date Office of Publ	nvironment. Required Signato Division, it is not necessary for the ESI ES Signature Date ES Initials ic Involvement Date	Date 4-30-19 Date
Appro Releas ESM In Certifi Note: D	Environmental A is necessary to det or documents prepared by to release for public involved ESM Signatur ESM Signatur See for Public Involved MA initials	ermine the effects on the error for Environmental Services Department or sign for approval. Date Date Date Office of Publ	ES Signature Date ES Initials ic Involvement Date	Date 4-30-19 Date
Appro Releas ESM In Certifi Note: D INDOT I	Environmental A is necessary to det is necessary to det or documents prepared by to release for public involved ESM Signatures for Public Involved Alpha initials cation of Public Involved on not approve until after ES/District Env. r Signature:	ermine the effects on the error for Environmental Services Devement or sign for approval. Date FHWA Signature Ement Office of Public or Section 106 public involver	ES Signature Date ES Initials ic Involvement Date Date: Date:	Date 4-30-19 Date
Appro Releas ESM In Certifi Note: D INDOT I	Environmental A is necessary to det is necessary to det or documents prepared by to release for public involved ESM Signatures for Public Involved Alpha initials cation of Public Involved on not approve until after ES/District Env. r Signature:	ermine the effects on the error for Environmental Services Dependent or sign for approval. Date FHWA Signature The ement Date Office of Public Section 106 public involver	ES Signature Date ES Initials ic Involvement Date Date: Date:	Date 4-30-19 Date

County _	Clinton County Route	SR 26	De	es. No140	00263	
		Part I - PUBLIC	INVOLVEMEN	<u>T</u>		
		evel of public involvement, I of public involvement sh				
If No	s the project have a histor o, then: pportunity for a Public He	ic bridge processed under tharing Required?	e Historic Bridges PA*?	Yes	No X	
	ring is required for all his D, and the ACHP.	foric bridges processed unde	er the Historic Bridges P	rogrammatic .	Agreement b	etween INDOT
	A notice of survey le	vities (legal notices, letters ewspaper articles, etc.) have etter was sent to property etter and list of recipients	occurred for this project owners adjacent to t	he project a	rea on Augi	
	Transportation (IND) offer the public an oplegal notice will appear	the minimum requirement of Public Involvement opertunity to submit comear in a local publication. This document will be revented to the publication of the publicatio	Manual that would rements and/or request contingent upon the	equire the page a public hear release of	project spor aring. There this docume	fore, a ent for
	by mail of the mee information meeting of SR 26 corridor project expected to be acquire	meeting was held on Jurting. The meeting annotiscussed Des. Nos. 14002t, and discussed the planted, and the proposed mainblic meeting or comment	uncement is in App. 163, 1592971, and 140 for construction, the antenance of traffic (M	pendix G (00000000000000000000000000000000000	G-4). This n are all part ght-of-way (public of the ROW)
	Properties Affected fi local paper, on Septer were received by the	arding Section 106 Area nding was published in 2 nber 30, 2018. A 30-day published deadline of Oc he copy of the public noti	The Times of Frankfor public comment periotober 29, 2018. The a	rt, Clinton (od was offer affidavit for	County, Indi red. No com the publicat	iana, a iments
	roversy on Environmen ect involve substantial con	tal Grounds troversy concerning commu	nity and/or natural resou	rce impacts?	Yes	No .X
Remarks:	At this time, the proj and/or natural resource	ect is not expected to invecting impacts.	olve substantial contro	oversy conce	erning comr	nunity
This is pa	age 2 Project nam	e: SR 26	Road Rehabilitation	Г	Date: April	26, 2019

County Clinton County Route SR 26 Des. No 1400263	
Part II - General Project Identification, Description, and Design In	<u>ıformation</u>
Sponsor of the Project: INDOT INDOT District: Crawf Local Name of the Facility: SR 26	fordsville
Funding Source (mark all that apply): Federal X State X Local Other*	
*If other is selected, please identify the funding source:	
PURPOSE AND NEED:	
Describe the transportation problem that the project will address. The solution to the traffic problem should NOT be in this section. (Refer to the CE Manual, Section IV.B.2. Purpose and Need) The purpose of the project is to improve the safety of SR 26, including the intersection with upgrading the road system to meet current INDOT design standards and to prevent premature deterioration by improving the drainage systems within the right-of-way in Clinton County. The need for this project is based on the current safety and geometric concerns on SR 26. The current features include narrower pavement than INDOT standards, no paved or unpaved shoulders, and standards are too steep on large parts of the corridor, which has prevented avoidance or recovery of leading in some cases to an increased severity of accidents. Because there is no shoulder, the expavement is also breaking away because it does not have the lateral support of a paved shoulder. Poor has been attributed to an accelerated deterioration of the roadway pavement. There are also safety of the intersection of SR 26 and SR 75. The current geometry does not allow for sufficient sight lines, been attributed to the cause of accidents at this intersection, and a recent analysis of crash data from to June 2016 shows a high crash frequency of 1.05 that exceeds acceptable levels for this type of road index of crash costs is 1.70, which indicates that crashes tend to be more severe. The SR 75 intersect of crash frequency is quite high at 2.50 indicating that there is a crash issue at this intersection. The crash cost is 1.89 indicating that the crashes that do occur tend to be severe.	sr 75, by a pavement on troadway side slopes of accidents, edge of the or drainage oncerns for which has a June 2012 adway. The ction index
PROJECT DESCRIPTION (PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE):	
County: Clinton Municipality: The project is not within a municipality.	
Limits of Proposed Work: 0.62 mile east of US 421 to 0.38 mile east of SR 75	
Total Work Length: 3.43 Mile(s) Total Work Area: N/A Acre(s) Yes ¹	No
Is an Interchange Modification Study / Interchange Justification Study (IMS/IJS) required? If yes, when did the FHWA grant a conditional approval for this project? Date:	. X
If an IMS or IJS is required; a copy of the approved CE/EA document must be submitted to the FHWA with a requapproval of the IMS/IJS.	uest for final
In the remarks box below, describe existing conditions, provide in detail the scope of work for the project, including preferred alternative. Include a discussion of logical termini. Discuss any major issues for the project and how the improve safety or roadway deficiencies if these are issues. The project is on SR 26 in Ross and Owen Townships, in Clinton County. The project limits are on town of Rossville, east toward the town limits of Sedalia as shown in Appendix B (B-2). The western is the eastern corporate limit of Rossville due to the change from urban to rural roadway character eastern terminus is the western town limit of Sedalia, which is approximately 0.37 mile east of the	utside of the ern terminus eristics. The

County Clinton County Route SR 26 Des. No. 1400263

of SR 26 and SR 75. The existing road is 22 feet (ft) wide from edge-of-pavement to edge-of-pavement. There is no shoulder on either side of the road. The edge of the pavement is breaking away because it does not have lateral support or a paved shoulder. In addition, drainage is poor, which is causing accelerated deterioration of the edge of the roadway. Permanent ROW will be acquired as part of this project and is discussed in detail in the Right-of-way section of this document. The adjacent ROW is largely rural and used for agricultural purposes.

The preferred alternative is to widen the pavement from 22 ft to 28 ft and improve the drainage ditches on either side of the road beginning at 0.62 mile east of US 421 to 0.38 mile east of SR 75. These termini have been chosen as they are the town limits for Rossville and Sedalia. The widening of the pavement will consist of adding paved shoulders. No additional travel lanes will be added. Centerline and edge line rumble stripping will be installed. At the intersection at SR 26 and SR 75, the intersection geometrics will be improved by adding designated left turn lanes installed at SR 26, which will improve sight lines for this intersection, and light emitting diode (LED) flashing stop signs will be installed on SR 75. This alternative will meet the purpose and need by improving the pavement, drainage, and safety by meeting current INDOT design standards, which will improve overall safety. The extent of work on SR 75 will be limited to the intersection with SR 26. Public road approaches meeting INDOT design standards are being added. The north approach is being shifted north to accommodate the left turn lanes being added on SR 26. Drainage is being improved with the crossing structures near the intersection being replaced. The existing drainage will be incorporated into the new drainage system that will be installed as part of this project. The roadway width will be widened to incorporate the additional turn lanes, going from 22 ft of pavement with no paved shoulders to 40 ft wide pavement with two 6-ft shoulders for a total width of 52 ft.

This alternative will also address the poor drainage around SR 26. Various structures will be replaced and installed to improve drainage as part of this project. Structures will be replaced with a similar pipe material while others may be replaced with larger structures due to hydrology requirements. For example, some pipes will be replaced with box culverts. The following two tables show the total list of structures to be replaced or installed within the proposed project area. These structures include Reinforced Concrete Pipe (RCP), Spiral Rib Metal Pipe (SRMP), and Corrugated Metal Pipe (CMP). The alternative reduces impacts to streams. Impacts to water resources are expected. There will be a total of 914 linear feet (lf) of impacts to an unnamed tributary (UNT) to Middle Fork of Wildcat Creek (UNT 11). All applicable avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures will be followed per the appropriate agency's guidance. One of the two grassed lined swales will be impacted a total of 0.008 acre. Road Side Ditches (RSD 17, RSD 18, and RSD 19) were identified within the survey area along the north and south sides of SR 26. Total impacts to these RSDs from replacements of small structures will be 0.185 acre. Further details and information about the impacts can be found in the Ecological Resources section of this document.

Mainline Structure Identifier Table

Within the Set declare I defined I asset								
Structure Identifier	Existing Size: Span x Rise	Proposed Size	Location	Station Number	Current Large Culvert Str. #	Work Description	Length	
W1	15 in RCP	21 in SRMP	Mainline Pipe	500+26	N/A	Pipe Replacement	60 ft	
W2	15 in CMP	3 ft x 2 ft Box	Mainline Str.	522+18	N/A	Pipe Replacement	52 ft	
W3	24 in CMP	30 in CMP	Mainline Pipe	550+55	N/A	Pipe Replacement	66 ft	
W4	4 ft x 6 ft Box	8 ft x 4 ft Box	Mainline Str.	556+75	026-012-53.40	Large Culvert Replacement	95 ft	

This is page 4

Project name:

SR 26 Road Rehabilitation

Date:

April 26, 2019

County Clinton County Route SR 26 Des. No. 1400263

W4A	12 in CMP	18 in CMP	Mainline Pipe	611+02	N/A	Pipe Replacement	62 ft
, W4B	15 in CMP	3 ft x 2 ft Box	Mainline Str.	615+87	N/A	Pipe Replacement	50 ft
W5	36 in CMP	14 ft x 3 ft Box	Mainline Str.	622+15	N/A	New Large Culvert	76 ft
W6	30 in CMP	9 ft x 4 ft Box	Mainline Str.	640+76	N/A	New Large Culvert	76 ft
W7	12 in CMP	15 in CMP	Mainline Pipe	646+79	N/A	Pipe Replacement	66 ft
W8	18 in CMP	21 in CMP	Mainline Pipe	652+78	N/A	Pipe Replacement	70 ft
W9	24 in CMP	7 ft x 3 ft Box	Mainline Str.	655+28	N/A	New Large Culvert	83 ft

Approach Structures Identifier Table

Approach Structure Identifier	Existing Size: Span x Rise	Proposed Size	Location	Station Number	Current Large Culvert Str.#	Work Description	Length
W1-2	None	3 ft x 2 ft Box	Drive Structure	500+75	N/A	New Structure	36 ft
W1-3	None	3 ft x 2 ft Box	Drive Structure	508+15	N/A.	New Structure	60 ft
W1-4	None	3 ft x 2 ft Box	Drive Structure	516+75	N/A	New Structure	44 ft
W2-1	None	3 ft x 2 ft Box	Drive Structure	519+50	N/A	New Structure	44 ft
W2-2	None	3 ft x 2 ft Box	Drive Structure	520+70	N/A	New Structure	36 ft
W3-1a (was W2-3)	None	3 ft x 2 ft Box	Drive Structure	527+90	N/A	New Structure	34 ft
W3-1	None	15 in CMP	Drive Structure	532+40	N/A	New Structure	60 ft
W3-2	None	3 ft x 2 ft Box	CR 330 W Str.	535+30	N/A	New Structure	82 ft
W3-3	None	18 in CMP	Drive Pipe	538+80	N/A	New Structure	62 ft
W3-4	1.2 ft x 1.8 ft CMP	30 in CMP	CR 300 W Pipe	548+75	N/A	Pipe Replacement	112 ft
W4-1	60 in CMP	8 ft x 4 ft Box	Drive Structure	564+75	Not found	Large Culvert Replacement	44 ft
W4-2	None	4 ft x 2 ft box	Drive Structure	575+60	N/A	New Large Culvert	72 ft
W4-3	None	36 in CMP	· Drive Pipe	589+05	N/A	New Structure	84 ft
W4-4	None	3 ft x 2 ft Box	CR 200 W Str. (N)	602+40	N/A	New Structure	82 ft

This is page 5 Project name: SR 26 Road Rehabilitation Date: April 26, 2019

County	Clinton County	Route	SR 26	39	Des. No.	1400263	
--------	----------------	-------	-------	----	----------	---------	--

1			GD 200	i i		Pipe	
W4-5	24 in CMP	3 ft x 2 ft Box	CR 200 W Str. (S)	602+40	N/A	Replacement	78 ft
		*	Drive			8	
W5-1	None	3 ft x 2 ft Box	Structure	624+10	N/A	New Structure	34 ft
W5-3			Drive	634+00-	27/4	>T (0)	150.6
(Drop Inlet)	None	12 in CMP	Pipe	635+50	N/A	New Structure	150 ft
W6-1	N	10 : CMD	Drive	637+45-	N/A	New Structure	130 ft
(Drop Inlet)	None	12 in CMP	Pipe	638+75	IV/A	New Structure	130 11
	None	7 ft x 3 ft Box	Drive	647+30	N/A	New Large	40 ft
W7-1	None	/ It x 3 It b0x	Structure	047130	14/77	Culvert	1011
W7-2	None	15 in CMP	Drive	650+50	N/A	Pipe	48 ft
VV 7-2	None	15 III CIVII	Pipe	050150	11/21	Replacement	
W9-1	24 in CMP	7 ft x 3 ft Box	SR 75	655+00	N/A	New Large	92 ft
VV 9-1	24 III CIVII	/ It x 5 It DOX	Structure	033.00	11/21	Culvert	
W9-2	None	15 in CMP	Drive	664+40	N/A	New Structure	50 ft
VV 9-2	TVOIC	15 III CIVII	Pipe	001.10			
W10-1	10 in CMP	3 ft x 2 ft Box	Drive	669+60	N/A	Pipe	62 ft
VV 10-1	10 III CIVII	JILKZILDOK	Structure	007.00	11111	Replacement	
W10-2	10 in RCP	3 ft x 2 ft Box	Drive	672+25	N/A	Pipe	42 ft
VY 10-2	TO III ICI	JILAZILDOA	Structure	0,2.25		Replacement	
W10-3	15 in RCP	3 ft x 2 ft Box	Drive	673+30	N/A	Pipe	46 ft
VY 10-3	15 III KCI	JILAZILDOX	Structure	3,3.30		Replacement	10700770

This project will have temporary impacts to the surrounding community. The current MOT includes phased construction and closures which can be found in Appendix B (B-28). Impacts to the surrounding community are further discussed in detail later in the Community Impacts section of this document.

This alternative is the most prudent option, although it will have temporary impacts to the surrounding community and it will minimize impacts to ecological resources. Therefore, it meets the purpose and need of this project by improving safety features and drainage along SR 26.

OTHER ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

Describe all discarded alternatives, including the Do-Nothing Alternative and an explanation of why each discarded alternative was not selected

Do Nothing/No Build Alternative: This alternative would result in not improving the road to meet current INDOT design standards, which will result in continued deterioration, insufficient drainage, and safety concerns. This alternative does not meet the current need for the project. This alternative will no longer be considered.

Widen roadway on both sides maintaining existing alignment and install rumble strips: The alternative does not correct the horizontal curves, which meet nominal standards but maintains short sight distances for drivers, decreasing safety and the ability to avoid accidents. This is not the preferred alternative due the cost of mitigation and the environmental impacts to the UNT of Middle Fork of Wildcat Creek (UNT 11). It is estimated that the impacts to UNT 11 would be 5,200 lf compared to the 914 lf of impacts in the preferred alternative. The alternative for the intersection of SR 26 and SR 75 includes installing a 4-way stop. This is also not preferred because the traffic is unbalanced, with about 75% of traffic coming from SR 26, which is the higher priority road. This alternative does not meet the purpose and need because it does not minimize ecological impacts, address drainage issues to prolong pavement, and does not correct intersection issues with SR 75; so it will no longer be considered.

This is page 6	Project name:	SR 26 Road Rehabilitation	Date:	April 26, 2019	
Tillo lo bage e					

County Clinton County	Route SR 26	Des. No. <u>1400263</u>
	• 0	
cost effective as it would a example, Wetland M (see there are three residence residential ROW impacts, is located in a grassed sy	require road realign Appendix F: F-3 s. If the road wa likely utility impay vale on the south be used to keep alternative will no	rnative would avoid all wetland impacts; however, it would not be nament and utility realignment to completely avoid the wetlands. For 7) runs parallel to and is south of the road. North of this wetland, is shifted to the north to avoid Wetland M, then there would be acts and higher associated costs. Wetland L (see Appendix F: F-33) side of the road. Only part of this wetland is contained within the impacts to a minimum. Due to the associated higher costs to shift longer be considered.
It would not correct existing It would not correct existing It would not correct the exis	capacity deficiencie safety hazards; ting roadway geome deteriorated condition	X
ROADWAY CHARAC	TER: SR 26	
P. d' - 1 Classifications	David Othor Dr	incinal Arterial
Functional Classification:		incipal Arterial VPD (2015) Design Year ADT: 7730 VPD (2039)
Current ADT:		k Percentage (%) 6.06
Design Hour Volume (DHV):		Il Speed (mph): 55
Designed Speed (mph):	55 Lega	in Speed (inpin)
	Existing	Proposed
Number of Lanes:	2	2
Type of Lanes:	Through	Through
Pavement Width:	22 ft.	28 ft.
Shoulder Width:	N/A ft.	2 ft.
Median Width:	N/A ft.	N/A ft.
Sidewalk Width:	N/A ft.	N/A ft.
Setting: [Topography:	Urban Level	Suburban X Rural Rolling Hilly
If the proposed action has mu	Itiple roadways, this	section should be filled out for each roadway.
		•
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
* **		

This is page 7 Project name:

SR 26 Road Rehabilitation

_____ Date: _April 26, 2019

County Clinton County	Route SR 26	Des. No1400263
ROADWAY CHARACTE	R: SR 75	
Functional Classification: Current ADT: Design Hour Volume (DHV): Designed Speed (mph):	55 Legal Speed (m	ge (%)
Number of Lanes: Type of Lanes: Pavement Width: Shoulder Width: Median Width: Sidewalk Width: Setting: Topography:	Existing 2 Through 22 ft. N/A ft. N/A ft.	Proposed 4 Through, turn lanes 40 ft. 12 ft. N/A N/A ft. N/A ft. Hilly Id be filled out for each roadway.
DESIGN CRITERIA FOR E	BRIDGES CV 026-012-53.40	Sufficiency Rating: 6, Culvert Inspection Report 2015 (Rating, Source of Information)
Bridge Type: Number of Spans: Weight Restrictions: Height Restrictions: Curb to Curb Width: Outside to Outside Width: Shoulder Width: Length of Channel Work:	4 ft x 6 ft Box Culvert 1	R ft x 4 ft Box Culvert 1
Remarks: Culvert C in the abo was hydromy Middle F INDOT C inspection that the erosion. scour and	CV 026-012-53.40 will be recove Mainline Structures table raulically inefficient and need fork of Wildcat Creek. The non February 24, 2015, which notes it was noted that there we southwest wingwall has broad broad and sediment build up.	placed as part of the road rehabilitation and is included as W4. A hydraulics report determined that this culvert eds to be replaced to improve drainage for an UNT to most recent Culvert Inspection Report was prepared by a can be found in Appendix I (I-9 to I-14). During this ere light abrasions along the bottom of the structure and oken and been replaced by riprap to prevent further of the structure was also noted, as was minor channel e included in Appendix B (B-8 to B-28).
	roject name:	SR 26 Road Rehabilitation Date: April 26, 2019

				Hansportation		
County	Clinton County	Route SR 26	6	Des. N	lo. 1400263	
4.0°	are discu	ssed in detail in	drainage structures on some the Project Description dge within the project a	n section of this doc	cument, this culve	rt is the
Vill the stru	ucture be rehabili ed action has mu	itated or replaced ultiple bridges or s	as part of the project? mall structures, this section		res No X por each structure.	N/A
IAINTEN	ANCE OF TRA	AFFIC (MOT) DU	JRING CONSTRUCTIO	N:		
s a tempor Vill the pro Provisio Provisio Provisio Vill the pro	ns will be made the m	posed? use of a detour or use of a detour or use for access by locator through-traffic of accommodate astantially change to	require a ramp closure? (c I traffic and so posted dependent businesses. any local special events or the environmental consequents that the proposed method for	festivals. uences of the action?	X X X X	X X X
Remarks:	proposes roa construction weeks during	nd closures and (stage 1 and stag construction. T will add approxim	will be temporarily in use of an official of use of an official of use 2) and closures. The official detour for smately 24.9 travel miles roximately 25.4 travel	detour. The current e road will be close stage 1 closure will under the stage 2 detour	nt MOT included of for approximate use SR 75, SR 18 will use SR 29, S	s phased ly 3 to 5, and US R 18 and
	It is the respo	onsibility of the veeks prior to an	project sponsor to noticy construction that wou	fy school corporationald block or limit acc	ns and emergency ess.	services
	The MOT pla	an can be found	in Appendix B (B-28).		0	
			*		2	
			•			
				• • •		
		<u>.</u>		* *.		

County	ounty Clinton County Route SR 26					Des. No1400263			
ESTIMAT	ED PROJECT C	OST AN	D SCHED	ULE:					
Engineerin		(2016, 2017-2		ight-of-Way:	\$ 894,000	(2018)	Construction:	\$ _5,100,000 (2020)	
Anticipated Start Date of Construction: April 2020							er .		
Date projec	ct incorporated into	STIP _	July 31, 2	017 (Appen	dix H: H-2)				
Is the proje If yes, Name of I	ect in an MPO Area	Ye.	_	lo K	, ,				
Location	of Project in TIP	N/A	77						
Date of in	corporation by refe	erence into	the STIP	N/A					
RIGHT O	WAY:					V			

	Amount	(acres)	
Land Use Impacts	Permanent	Temporary	
Residential	5.39	0.6379	
Commercial	0.984	0.005	
Agricultural	11.8	0.21	
Forest	4.95	0	
Wetlands	0.203	0	
Other: Reacquired	21.524	0	
TOTAL	44.852	0.8529	

Describe both Permanent and Temporary right-of-way and describe their current use. Typical and Maximum right-of-way widths (existing and proposed) should also be discussed. Any advance acquisition or reacquisition, either known or suspected, and there impacts on the environmental analysis should be discussed.

Remarks:

The project requires approximately 44.85 acres of permanent ROW. This ROW is largely used for agricultural purposes with some residential and commercial use. The project also requires approximately 0.85 acre of temporary ROW that is also largely agricultural with some residential and commercially used ROW.

The width of ROW is approximately 50 ft to 100 ft from the centerline of SR 26. Approximately 21.52 acres of reacquired ROW from both sides of the roadway will be acquired for this project. Additional ROW is currently used largely for agricultural purposes with some residential use as well.

Due to the aggressive timeline of the project, early acquisition of ROW was completed. This advance acquisition was approved by INDOT on September 25, 2018, for a total of 44.9 acres of ROW purchased from 61 parcels. The ROW was purchased as strip ROW. ROW was acquired in accordance with the Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (Uniform Act) and the early acquisition did not influence the selection of the preferred alternative. No relocations were required for this project.

	ons were required	for this project.		•
The projec	t plan set in include	ed in Appendix B (B-8 to B-28).		
This is page 10	Project name: _	SR 26 Road Rehabilitation	Date:	April 26, 2019
		Form Version: June 2013 Attachment 2		